

### III. REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-11, 14, 16-22, and 25-31 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8, 11, and 26 have been amended, and claims 2 and 23 have been cancelled. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious allowance of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14, 16-23, and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Church et al. (US Pat. No. 5,794,234, hereinafter, “Church”) in view of Tammaro (US Pat. Pub. No. 20010011246, hereinafter, “Tammaro”). With respect to independent claims 1, 11, 18, and 26, Applicants have amended these claims herein, and respectfully submit that Church and Tammaro do not teach each and every element of the invention as claimed herein. With regard to the amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that no new subject matters is presented herein.

The feature of “at the automotive information exchange system, mapping the transaction element and the response transaction element with a mapping system, wherein the mapping comprises identifying the first trading partner, identifying the second trading partner, and identifying an application to which the transaction element corresponds” (claim 11, lines 8-11), previously recited in claim 11, lines 18-20, finds support in the specification as filed at p. 17, lines 9-12; and p. 12, line 22 through p. 13, line 3; among other passages. The feature of “after mapping the transaction element, translating the transaction element ...” (claim 11, line 12 *et seq.*) finds support in the specification as filed at p. 13, lines 3-5, among other passages. The

feature of “after translating, routing the transaction element from the first trading partner in a first communication protocol ... wherein the first and second communication protocol comprise SOAP/XML, ODBC/JDBC, MQ, HTTP/XML, COM/COM+, RPC, CORBA/IIOP, OTMA, or WAP” (claim 11, lines 17-20) finds support in the specification as filed at p. 12, lines 13-16, among other passages. The feature of “managing the transaction element and the response transaction element with a transaction management system, wherein the managing step comprises tracking a status ... and providing the status of the transaction element and the response transaction element to the first or second trading partner upon the first or second trading partner’s inquiry” (claim 11, line 27 *et seq.*) finds support in the specification as filed at p. 17, lines 14-18, among other passages. Claims 1, 18, and 26 have been analogously amended, and are similarly supported.

With regard to the feature of “at the automotive information exchange system, mapping the transaction element and the response transaction element with a mapping system, wherein the mapping comprises identifying the first trading partner, identifying the second trading partner, and identifying an application to which the transaction element corresponds” (claim 11, lines 8-11), Applicants respectfully submit that this feature is not taught by either of Church, upon which the Office relies, or Tammaro. Church teaches a system in which “initially, the trading partner client computer prepares one or more outgoing transmission files 236 containing transactions for transmission to one or more trading partners (step 602).” (Col. 11, lines 10-12.) “The outgoing transmitted files are 244 are transmitted to the network server 108. At this time, the network server 108 transmits to the client computer one or more incoming transmission files 246.” No mapping system of any kind is taught with respect to the network server, much less

“identifying the first trading partner, identifying the second trading partner, and identifying an application to which the transaction element corresponds.”

With regard to the feature of “after mapping the transaction element, translating the transaction element ...” (claim 11, line 12 *et seq.*), Applicants similarly submit that Church, upon which the Office relies, and Tammaro fail to teach this feature. Because mapping, as defined above, does not occur in Church, it is impossible for the translating to occur “after mapping the transaction element.”

With regard to the feature of “after translating, routing the transaction element from the first trading partner in a first communication protocol ... wherein the first and second communication protocol comprise SOAP/XML, ODBC/JDBC, MQ, HTTP/XML, COM/COM+, RPC, CORBA/IIOP, OTMA, or WAP” (claim 11, lines 17-20), Applicants further submit that Church and Tammaro fail to teach this feature. In the Final Office Action, the Office relies on Church at col. 2, lines 46-51; and col. 4, lines 32-37 to teach this feature. However, the cited passages refer to the steps of encryption of the data before transporting the data to the network server, subsequent decryption and distribution of the data into one or more transmission files, and re-encryption, followed by routing of the data to the appropriate client computer. Encryption and decryption are completely non-analogous with the communication protocols recited in claim 11, including “SOAP/XML, ODBC/JDBC, MQ, HTTP/XML, COM/COM+, RPC, CORBA/IIOP, OTMA, or WAP.” Tammaro further fails to teach this feature.

With regard to the feature of “managing the transaction element and the response transaction element with a transaction management system, wherein the managing step comprises tracking a status ... and providing the status of the transaction element and the response transaction element to the first or second trading partner upon the first or second trading”

partner's inquiry" (claim 11, line 27 *et seq.*), Applicants further submit that Church and Tammaro fail to teach this feature. Church, upon which the Office relies, teaches "the network server ... post[ing] each transaction in its transaction database in order to perform tracking operations or reporting information." (Col. 13, lines 29-31.) However, no teaching or suggestion of "providing the status of the transaction element and the response transaction element to the first or second trading partner upon the first or second trading partner's inquiry" is made in either of Church or Tammaro.

Accordingly, in view of at least the amendments and remarks presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Church and Tammaro do not teach each and every element of claim 11, and request withdrawal of the rejection under § 103(a).

As indicated in the Final Office Action at p. 6, claims 1-2, 4-10, 18-23, 25, and 26-31 closely parallel and are encompassed by claims 11, 14, 16, and 17.

With respect to the rejections of independent claims 1, 18, and 26, Applicants note that each claim as amended herein includes features similar in scope to those addressed above with respect to claim 11. Further, the Office relies on the same arguments and interpretations of Church and Tammaro as discussed above with respect to claim 11. To this extent, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to claim 11, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 18, and 26 for the above-stated reasons.

With respect to claims 4-10, 14, 16, 17, 19-22, 25, and 27-31 Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable for reasons stated above relative to independent claims 1, 11, 18, and 26, as well as for their own additional claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to claims 4-10, 14, 16, 17, 19-22, 25, and 27-31.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the Application as presented is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hunter E. Webb/  
Hunter E. Webb  
Reg. No. 54,593

Date: June 2, 2008

(JMT)

Hoffman Warnick LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, New York 12207  
Phone: (518) 449-0044  
Fax: (518) 449-0047